

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number

0500-0614

Case Title:

Village of Crestwood, IL

Reporting Office:

Chicago, IL, Area Office

Subject of Report:

Burke Engineering search warrant interview of (b) (7)
(b) (7)

Activity Date:

June 25, 2009

Copies to:

Related Files:

Reporting Official and Date:

(b) (7)(C) SA
09-JUL-2009, Signed by: (b) (7)(C), SA

Approving Official and Date:

(b) (7)(C) SAC
10-JUL-2009, Approved by: (b) (7)(C), SAC

SYNOPSIS

06/25/2009 - On June 25, 2009 (b) (7)(C), Vice President of Burke Engineering, was interviewed during a search warrant at Burke Engineering in Orland Park, Illinois. (b) (7) stated Burke Engineering did not include the well usage on the LMO reports as Crestwood requested, and they did as Crestwood asked in order to keep the client happy.

DETAILS

On June 25, 2009, this reporting agent, Special Agent (b) (7)(C), along with Special Agent (b) (7)(C), interviewed (b) (7)(C) (b) (7)(C)). The interview took place at Burke Engineering during a search warrant. (b) (7) had been previously interviewed by another EPA-CID agent.

(b) (7)(C) stated (b) (7) did not recall directing (b) (7)(C) to not include the well information on the 2008 LMO report but it is possibly true (b) (7) told (b) (7)(C) not to use the well information.

(b) (7)(C) stated Burke Engineering plays the role of servant to the Village of Crestwood. (b) (7)(C) stated Crestwood was told about the well and how it looks to exclude the well on the reports but that they understood the village did not want the well usage known. (b) (7) stated that Burke got the numbers from Crestwood with the well numbers included but the village of Crestwood did not want them included in the LMO report so they were not included year after year. (b) (7) stated (b) (7) assumed the LMO report is just a form used to show Crestwood is not wasting water and that excess water usage is why Crestwood did not want the well usage in the LMO report. (b) (7)(C) stated (b) (7) did not feel uncomfortable submitting the LMO reports without the well information at any point and that was what was needed to keep the client happy. (b) (7) stated that (b) (7) does not think there will be any record of conversations regarding not using well information in Burke records.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number

0500-0614

(b) (7) stated Burke had no recent conversations with the Village of Crestwood about well usage. (b) (7)(C) stated they would take the old LMO forms and complete the new LMO report the same way. (b) (7) stated Burke just continued to follow the same pattern over the years and it goes back so far (b) does not remember who originally asked that the well usage not be included in the LMO reports.

(b) (7) stated (b) (7)(C) is the engineering point of contact for Crestwood. (b) (7) stated (b) knew about the use of the well by Crestwood but did not know about the contamination.

(b) (7) stated (b) did not do any duplicate reports for Crestwood with and without the well data. (b) (7) stated (b) started looking at the past reports for Crestwood when the first search warrant was done and in the news. (b) (7) stated it was at this point (b) became aware of the two sets of reports. (b) (7) stated (b) and (b) (7)(C) had discussions after the Crestwood search warrant regarding the two sets of reports and the well information that was not shared for 25 years. (b) (7) stated that this information was also brought to the attention of (b) (7)(C). (b) (7)(C) stated when (b) found out about the two reports with and without the well information the discussion centered around it not looking good for Burke Engineering.

(b) (7) stated (b) did the LMO reports in the past but did not remember what specific years. (b) (7) stated (b) did what Burke was expected to do by Crestwood with regard to the reports and did what they needed to do to keep the client. (b) (7) stated (b) did not know the well was not supposed to be used, but did not include its usage in the LMO reports (b) completed because that is what the village of Crestwood wanted done.

(b) (7)(C) stated (b) knew about the concerns about contamination at the Crestwood well before the Crestwood search warrant. (b) (7) stated (b) saw an EPA report in 2008 that said vinyl chloride levels were above normal levels at the Crestwood well and this is where (b) gained (b) knowledge about vinyl chloride at the Crestwood well.

(b) (7)(C) stated four to six years ago, Christopher Burke Engineering was Crestwood's engineering firm and that we should check to see how they reported the well information during that time period.

(b) (7) stated (b) contacts at the Village of Crestwood were (b) (7)(C) (Phonetic) and (b) (7)(C) (Phonetic) relating to well issues. (b) (7)

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.

**United States Environmental Protection Agency
Criminal Investigation Division
Investigative Activity Report**

Case Number

0500-0614

stated (b) knows that (b) (7)(C) (phonetic) is the water operator for the village of Crestwood.

(b) (7) stated since the media report of the search warrant at Crestwood (b) has had contact with (b) (7)(C) (Phonetic) at the Village of Crestwood and has discussed the dilution of vinyl chlorides in water with (b) (7)(C) (Phonetic).

(b) (7) was shown an April 9, 2009 letter from (b) (7) to the Mayor of Crestwood regarding the 2008 LMO analysis, recommending Crestwood raise the water rates. (b) stated (b) decided on (b) own to send this letter and that the letter is not media related and the well information has nothing to do with the letter.

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the EPA.
It is the property of the EPA and is loaned to your agency;
it and its contents are not to be distributed outside your agency.